



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/631,243	07/31/2003	Kimberly D. Seaman	020420	1608
26285	7590	06/26/2008	EXAMINER	
KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART PRESTON GATES ELLIS LLP 535 SMITHFIELD STREET PITTSBURGH, PA 15222				LIU, ALAN Y
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3691				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/26/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/631,243	SEAMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ALAN LIU	3691	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 July 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 31 July 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/6/2004.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is a first Office Action Non-Final rejection on the merits.
Claims 1-42, as originally filed, are currently pending and have been considered below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. **Claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.**

Claims 1-40 recite a process comprising the steps of receiving, matching, generating, and performing. Based on Supreme Court precedent, a proper process must be tied to another statutory class or transform underlying subject matter to a different state or thing (*Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876)). Since neither of these requirements is met by the claim, the method is not considered a patent eligible process under 35 U.S.C. 101. To qualify as a statutory process, the claim should positively recite the other statutory class to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplished the method steps or positively reciting the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-5, 8-10, 15, 29, 36-37, and 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lewis (2002/0065752).

As per claim 1, Lewis discloses a method for managing corporate action information of at least one entity (Abstract; page 1, paragraph 0008) said method comprising:

receiving data associated with at least one corporate action of at least one of said entities (page 1, paragraph 0010, via Market Data Information Server receiving a corporate action notification);

matching at least a portion of said corporate action data to at least one client of the financial institution (pages 1-2, paragraph 0010, via Customers or Counterparties entitled to proceeds of the corporate action);

generating at least one notification including at least a portion of said corporate action data (pages 1-2, paragraph 0010, via Alert Notification Server sending a notification to Customers or Counterparties); and,

performing at least one workflow management activity in connection with generating said notification including said corporate action data (page 10, paragraph 0127, via Market Data Information Server processes inputs containing prices and corporate action announcements).

As per claim 2, Lewis discloses communicating said notification to at least one recipient of said corporate action data (pages 1-2, paragraph 0010, via Alert Notification Server sending a notification to Customers or Counterparties).

As per claim 3, Lewis discloses soliciting a response from said recipient of said notification (page 10, paragraph 0127, via tracking sent alerts and whether a response has been received).

As per claim 4, Lewis discloses soliciting a response from said recipient based on a non-response of said recipient to said notification (page 10, paragraph 0127, via tracking sent alerts and whether a response has been received, therefore a non-response is also a response of sorts).

As per claim 5, Lewis discloses communicating at least one additional notification subsequent to said communicating first said notification (page 10, paragraph 0127, via additional reminder alerts).

As per claim 8, Lewis discloses tracking at least a portion of said corporate action data for identifying at least one change in position associated with said portion of said corporate action data (page 10, paragraph 0127, via Accounting Information Server updates the positions that are entitled to the proceeds from the corporate action).

As per claim 9, Lewis discloses generating at least one alert in response to at least one change in at least one eligible position associated with said corporate action data (page 10, paragraph 0127, via Accounting Information Server updates the positions that are entitled to the proceeds from the corporate action; pages 1-2, paragraph 0010, via Alert Notification Server sends a notification to Customers or Counterparties that are entitled to the proceeds of the corporate action).

As per claim 10, Lewis discloses said corporate action data includes data associated with a voluntary corporate action (page 10, paragraph 0127, via voluntary corporate action).

As per claim 15, Lewis discloses designating at least a portion of said corporate action data with a status of automatically notify (pages 1-2, paragraph 0010, via notifications are sent automatically by the Alert Notification Server).

As per claim 29, Lewis discloses viewing at least one user assigned to at least a portion of said corporate action data (pages 1-2, paragraph 0010, via Customers or Counterparties entitled to the proceeds of the corporate action are viewable through the Alert Notification Server).

As per claim 36, Lewis discloses displaying holder information associated with said corporate action data (Figure 24, via portfolio summary).

As per claim 37, Lewis discloses generating a notification for communication to at least one holder in association with said holder information (pages 1-2, paragraph 0010, via Alert Notification Server sending a notification to Customers or Counterparties entitled to proceeds of the corporate action).

As per claim 41, Lewis discloses a system for managing corporate action information of at least one entity (Abstract; page 1, paragraph 0008), said system comprising:

at least one server configured for receiving data associated with at least one corporate action of at least one of said entities (page 1, paragraph 0010, via Market Data Information Server receiving a corporate action notification);

at least one software module configured for matching at least a portion of said corporate action data to at least one client of the financial institution (pages 1-2, paragraph 0010, via Customers or Counterparties entitled to proceeds of the corporate action);

at least one software module configured for generating at least one notification including at least a portion of said corporate action data (pages 1-2, paragraph 0010, via Alert Notification Server sending a notification to Customers or Counterparties); and,

at least one software module Configured for performing at least one workflow management activity in connection with generating said notification including said corporate action data (page 10, paragraph 0127, via Market Data Information Server processes inputs containing prices and corporate action announcements).

As per claim 42, Lewis discloses a computer-readable medium including instructions for performing a method for managing corporate action information of at least one entity (Abstract; page 1, paragraph 0008; page 6, paragraph 0067), said medium comprising:

instructions for receiving data associated with at least one corporate action of at least one of said entities (page 1, paragraph 0010, via Market Data Information Server receiving a corporate action notification);

instructions for matching at least a portion of said corporate action data to at least one client of the financial institution (pages 1-2, paragraph 0010, via Customers or Counterparties entitled to proceeds of the corporate action);

instructions for generating at least one notification including at least a portion of said corporate action data (pages 1-2, paragraph 0010, via Alert Notification Server sending a notification to Customers or Counterparties); and,

instructions for performing at least one workflow management activity in connection with execution of said instructions for generating said notification including said corporate action data (page 10, paragraph 0127, via Market Data Information Server processes inputs containing prices and corporate action announcements).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 6, 13-14, 16-17, 19-22, 30-33, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis as applied to claims 1 and 5 above in view of Examiner's Official Notice.

As per claim 6, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose communicating said additional notification in association with at least one change to said corporate action data.

Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art to notify a client if there has been a change in a corporate action. For example, if announced stock dividends are going to be a different amount, investors would be notified of the change.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the additional notification of Lewis to include notifying due to a change in a corporate action as taught by Examiner's Official Notice in order to keep the clients up to date on relevant information.

As per claim 13, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose purging at least a portion of said corporate action data, wherein said portion of said corporate action data is not associated with an eligible position of said financial institution.

Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art to purge a portion of data that is not associated with an eligible position. For example, if a part of a corporate action does not affect any positions held by investors via the financial institution, that portion of the data would be eliminated.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include purging a portion of the corporate action data not associated with an eligible position as taught by Examiner's Official Notice in order to remove irrelevant data.

As per claim 14, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose associating a category of incomplete notification with at least a portion of said corporate action data.

Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art to keep track of incomplete notifications. For example, any notifications that are unsuccessfully sent can be sent the next day.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include keeping track of incomplete notifications as taught by Examiner's Official Notice in order to create a category for incomplete notifications in the data so that the notifications can be completed at a later time.

As per claim 16, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose designating at least a portion of said corporate action data in an aged outstanding payments category.

Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art to keep track of outstanding payments. For example, if dividends are issued and the deadline for payment to investors has passed, these would be considered aged outstanding payments.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include keeping track of aged outstanding payments as taught by Examiner's Official Notice in order to make the payments as soon as possible.

As per claim 17, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose wherein said aged outstanding payments category includes a portion of said corporate action data having a processing status one of active status and completed status, and wherein a current date is later than a predesignated expiration date associated with said portion of corporate action data, and wherein a required payment associated with said portion said corporate action data has not been received.

Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art to keep track of the processing status of outstanding payments. For example, if dividends are issued and the deadline for payment to investors has passed, these would be considered aged outstanding payments. Once the payment is made, the processing status would be considered complete.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include keeping track of the processing status of aged outstanding payments as taught by Examiner's Official Notice in order to check if processing has been completed or not.

As per claim 19, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose associating an uncovered protects category with at least a portion of said corporate action data.

Examiner takes Official Notice that uncovered protects are old and well known in the art. For example, a normal warrant is uncovered, as opposed to a covered warrant. Also, many corporate actions come with protect dates, e.g. the DTC expiration date.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include uncovered protects as taught by Examiner's Official Notice because they are a type of corporate action.

As per claim 20, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose associating a covered protect category with at least a portion of said portion of said corporate action data included within said uncovered protects category.

Examiner takes Official Notice that covered protects are old and well known in the art. For example, covered warrants are special kinds of warrants.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art a the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include covered protects as taught by Examiner's Official Notice because they are a type of corporate action.

As per claim 21, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose associating an over-committed category with at least a portion of said corporate action data.

Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art to overcommit for a corporate action. For example, there may be an error with a corporate action and the response value is greater than the actual position held.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include an over-committed category as taught by Examiner's Official Notice in order to recognize mistakes so they can be corrected.

As per claim 22, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose associating an under-committed category with at least a portion of said corporate action data.

Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art to undercommit for a corporate action. For example, there may be an error with a corporate action and the response value is less than the actual position held.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include an under-committed category as taught by Examiner's Official Notice in order to recognize mistakes so they can be corrected.

As per claim 30, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose associating a new holders category with at least a portion of said corporate action data.

Examiner takes Official Notice that associating new holders with corporate actions is old and well known in the art. For example, if some customers recently became new holders, they may be affected by a corporate action.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include associating new holders with corporate actions as taught by Examiner's Official Notice in order to ensure new holders are included in the processing of a corporate action.

As per claim 31, Lewis discloses associating an associated offer category with at least a portion of said corporate action data.

Examiner takes Official Notice that associated offers are old and well known in the art. For example, multiple events could take place in one corporate action.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include associated offers as taught by Examiner's Official Notice in order to distinguish corporate actions with associated offers from corporate actions with a single offer.

As per claim 32, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose associating a competing offer category with at least a portion of said corporate action data.

Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art to have competing offers for corporate actions. For example, voluntary corporate actions could be considered competing offers—choosing either to participate or not.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include competing offers as taught by Examiner's Official Notice in order to designate a category for cases where the investor has a choice.

As per claim 33, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose associating a not fully responded category with at least a portion of said corporate action data.

Examiner takes Official Notice that a not fully responded category is and old well known in the art. For example, if someone has not sent a complete response, it would be considered not fully responded.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include a not fully responded category as taught by Examiner's Official Notice in order to keep track of incomplete responses.

As per claim 38, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose displaying a position status associated with at least a portion of said corporate action data.

Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art to display pertinent information. For example, it is useful to display whether positions are eligible or not for a corporate action.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include displaying position status as taught by Examiner's Official Notice in order to show relevant information associated with the corporate action.

8. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis as applied to claim 1 above in view of Zangari et al. (2002/0184133).

As per claim 7, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose generating a list of action items associated with said corporate action data.

Zangari et al. teaches a method and system for verifying in the integrity of data in a data warehouses with a corporate action processing module that generates a list of action items associated with the corporate action (page 5, paragraphs 0056-0057).

From this teaching of Zangari et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action information of Lewis to include generating a list of action items associated with said corporate action data as taught by Zangari et al. in order to process the corporate action data.

9. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis as applied to claim 1 above in view of Lupien et al. (5,101,353).

As per claim 11, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose generating an end-of-the-day report for displaying actions associated with said corporate action data.

Lupien et al. teaches an automated system for providing liquidity to securities markets that generates an end-of-the-day report for displaying actions associated with said corporate action data (col. 17, lines 14-17, via updating data files to reflect corporate actions relating to all managed securities; col. 12, lines 8-20, via end-of-day reports of all transactions).

From this teaching of Lupien et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action information of Lewis to include generating an end-of-day report as taught by Lupien et al. in order to summarize all the corporate action data.

10. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis in view of Lupien et al. as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Examiner's Official Notice.

As per claim 12, the Lewis and Lupien combination discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose grouping at least a portion of data included within said end-of-the-day report by a designation selected from the group consisting of a user name, a category, and an action type.

Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art to group data on an end-of-the-day report. For example, a report covering the day's transactions can have the transactions grouped by transaction type.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the end-of-the-day report of the Lewis and Lupien combination to include grouping data as taught by Examiner's Official Notice in order to present information in an organized manner.

11. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis as applied to claim 1 above in view of Graff (6,192,347).

As per claim 18, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose associating a payable today category with at least a portion of said corporate action data.

Graff teaches a system and method for computing to support decomposing property into separately valued components where the corporate actions have a specific payable date (col. 223, lines 21-24).

From this teaching of Graff, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include a payable date as taught by Graff in order to determine which corporate actions are payable today.

12. Claims 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis as applied to claim 1 above in view of Gregov et al. (7,376,588).

As per claim 23, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose associating a new announcement category with at least a portion of said corporate action data.

Gregov et al. teaches personalized promotion of new content where information about new announcements is displayed to the user (col. 7, lines 46-50).

From this teaching of Gregov et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include new announcement information as taught by Gregov et al. in order to create a category for new announcements and keep the data more organized.

As per claim 24, Lewis discloses allowing automatic notification for at least a portion of said portion of said corporate action data included with said new announcement category (pages 1-2, paragraph 0010, via notifications are sent automatically by the Alert Notification Server).

13. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis as applied to claim 1 above in view of Haviv-Segal et al. (2002/0049705).

As per claim 25, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose associating a new source category with at least a portion of said corporate action data.

Haviv-Segal et al. teaches a method for creating content oriented databases and content files with a new source category (page 7, paragraph 0084, via tagging every new source).

From this teaching of Haviv-Segal et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include a new source category as taught by Haviv-Segal et al. in order to determine which corporate actions have new sources.

14. Claims 26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis as applied to claim 1 above in view of Knegendorf et al. (2003/0040929).

As per claim 26, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose generating at least one master announcement summary page in association with said corporate action data.

Knegendorf et al. teaches a method for distributing product hazard information with a summary page of notifications (page 8, paragraph 0087).

From this teaching of Knegendorf et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include a summary page as taught by Knegendorf et al. in order to summarize all information in one location.

As per claim 28, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose using said master announcement summary page for reviewing at least one change to said corporate action data.

Knegendorf et al. teaches a method for distributing product hazard information where the summary page is reviewed (page 8, paragraph 0087).

From this teaching of Knegendorf et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include reviewing the summary page as taught by Knegendorf et al. in order to go over any changes that may have occurred.

15. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis in view of Knegendorf et al. as applied to claim 26 above, and further in view of Examiner's Official Notice.

As per claim 27, the Lewis and Knegendorf combination discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose generating said master announcement summary page once said financial institution identifies the existence of at least one holder eligible to participate in connection with said corporate action data.

Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art to generate a summary page if there is at least one eligible position. For example, if a corporate action does not affect any positions held via the financial institution, it would be fairly useless to produce a blank summary page.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the generating of an announcement summary page of the Lewis and Knegendorf combination to include generating if there is an eligible position as taught by Examiner's Official Notice in order to avoid performing unnecessary actions.

16. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis as applied to claim 1 above in view of Martone et al. (2002/0138389).

As per claim 35, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose modifying at least one entitlement associated with at least a portion of said corporate action data.

Martone et al. teaches a financial service system that allows modifying at least one entitlement (page 5, paragraph 0098, via updating entitlement database).

From this teaching of Martone et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include modifying at least one entitlement as taught by Martone et al. in order to allow for changes.

17. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis as applied to claim 1 above in view of Cornelius et al. (6,629,081).

As per claim 34, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose logging at least one change associated with said corporate action data in an audit log.

Cornelius et al. teaches account settlement and financing with an audit log (col. 78, lines 38-42).

From this teaching of Cornelius et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of managing corporate action data of Lewis to include an audit log as taught by Cornelius et al. in order to create a log for auditing purposes.

18. Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis as applied to claim 1 above in view of Knapp (2003/0078794).

As per claim 39, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose displaying a response status associated with at least a portion of said corporate action data.

Knapp teaches a system and method for facilitating specifier and supplier communications that displays the status of responses (page 8, paragraph 0078).

From this teaching of Knapp, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include displaying a response status as taught by Knapp in order to show whether an investor has responded or not.

19. Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis as applied to claim 1 above in view of Kumagai et al. (6,996,563).

As per claim 40, Lewis discloses all elements of the claimed invention, but fails to expressly disclose generating a notification history in association with at least a portion of said corporate action data.

Kumagai et al. teaches a communication system and method with notification history information (col. 8, lines 20-22).

From this teaching of Kumagai et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing corporate action data of Lewis to include a notification history as taught by Kumagai et al. in order to show past notifications.

Conclusion

20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Calo et al. (2002/0087454) discloses a global trading system.

Campbell et al. (6,856,970) discloses an electronic financial transaction system.

El-Kadi et al. (6,014,642) discloses a system for benefits processing.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALAN LIU whose telephone number is (571)270-5113. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 8:30AM-6:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on 571-272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Alexander Kalinowski/

Application/Control Number: 10/631,243
Art Unit: 3691

Page 24

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3691

AL